

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to delete an extraneous "(1)" and claims 7-8 and 21-22 are amended for consistency. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments only address readability and consistency; (c) do not present any additional claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Riley during the July 28, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied References

The Office Action (1) rejects claims 1-10, 15-24, 29-34 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,678,064 to Bruce; and (2) rejects claims 11-14, 25-28 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bruce in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,790 to Yellepeddy. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Regarding independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 36, Bruce fails to disclose "a controller that: enables editing of the printing data previously stored in the memory of the image forming device" (claim 1); "editing means for enabling editing of the printing data previously stored in the storage means of the image forming device" (claim 15); "allowing editing of the printing data previously stored in the image forming device" (claim 29); and "an editing part that sets the printing data stored in the memory to an editing-allowable state according to a request from the host device" (claim 36).

In the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action states that the Examiner understands that printing data is not a print request.

Regarding independent claims 1, 15 and 29, in the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action alleges that Bruce discloses the claimed controller / editing means / step of editing "for editing of the printing data previously stored in the memory of the image forming device" (independent claim 1, similarly recited in independent claims 15 and 29) at col. 9, lines 25-28 and at col. 2, lines 13-22.

As quoted by the Office Action, Bruce col. 9, lines 25-28 states: "Referring to FIG. 3, printing device 130 includes a display with a touch screen 320 for providing a user with an interactive menu to view, control, and manipulate print requests stored in the memory queue, at step 415" (emphasis added). This section states merely that print requests can be manipulated, which the Office Action, as discussed above, acknowledges is different than print data. This section thus does not disclose the capability to edit print data.

As quoted by the Office Action, Bruce col. 2, lines 13-22 states "In one embodiment, a printing system for processing one or more print requests includes: a print queue for storing data associated with one or more print requests, a display screen for displaying the content of the print queue; control interface for controlling the processing order of print requests in the queue; and executable code stored in a memory, wherein execution of the code by a processor causes the processor to process the print requests stored in the queue in response to user interaction with the control interface." (emphasis added). This section thus does not disclose the capability to edit print data.

Regarding independent claim 36, the Office Action, in the Response to Arguments section, alleges that Bruce discloses the claimed editing part at col. 2, lines 13-22 and at col. 9, lines 25-33. These sections are the same sections cited by the Office Action as disclosing the controller / editing means / step of editing of claims 1, 15 and 29. For the same reasons as

discussed above, these sections do not disclose the claim 36 editing part that sets the printing data stored in the memory to an editing-allowable state.

Yellapeddy, applied in relation to claims 11-14, 25-28 and 35, does not cure the deficiencies of Bruce.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/ccs

Date: September 17, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--